



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/407,768	09/29/1999	TERUYUKI MARUYAMA	0557-4782-2	3179
22850	7590	02/04/2005	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2165

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/407,768	MARUYAMA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Neveen Abel-Jalil	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.


**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/4/04, 6/21/04, 11/1/04, 12/2/04</u>	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed on June 21, 2004 has been received and entered. Claims 1-30 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 14-15, 18-19, 20-21, 23- 26, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,813 B1) in view of Yamazaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,670,933 B1).

As to claim 1, Enright et al. teaches a filing system in which at least one data processing apparatus is connected to a file server via a transmission path, comprising:

a data capturing unit which captures image data of a document into the data processing apparatus (See Enright et al. column 9, lines 23-45);

a data storing unit which stores the image data captured by the data capturing unit, onto an image storage medium (see Enright et al. column 14, lines 23-48, where “data capturing unit” is read on “cameras and other input devices”);

an authorized user identifying unit which acquires one or a plurality of owner identifications when the image data is captured by the data capturing unit (see Enright et al. column 24, lines 7-45, where “owner identifications” is read on “identify the user”);  
an access management unit which correlates the owner identifications with the image data stored by the data storing unit, and allows the stored image data to be accessed when any of the owner identifications correlated with the image data is verified (see Enright et al. column 14, lines 49-67, also see Enright et al. column 16, lines 1-20); and

a data output unit which outputs the image data in a readable manner by retrieving the stored image data of the image storage medium when the access to the image data is allowed by the access management unit (see Enright et al. column 13, lines 15-62).

Enright et al. does not teach each of the plurality of owner identification corresponding to respective one of a plurality of entities.

Yamazaki teaches each of the plurality of owner identification corresponding to respective one of a plurality of entities (See Yamazaki column 16, lines 1-26, also see Yamazaki column 2, lines 8-19, also see Yamazaki column 1, lines 16-30, prior art).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Enright et al. to include each of the plurality of owner identification corresponding to respective one of a plurality of entities.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Enright et al. by the teaching of Honda et al. to include each of the plurality of owner identification corresponding to respective one of a plurality of entities because it provides secure and accurate data.

As to claim 2, Enright et al. as modified teaches wherein the authorized user identifying unit acquires one or a plurality of operator identifications when the image data is captured by the data capturing unit, and wherein the access management unit correlates the operator identifications with the image data stored by the data storing unit, and allows the stored image data to be accessed when one of the operator identifications correlated with the image data is verified (See Enright et al. column 24, lines 7-45, where “owner identifications” is read on “identify the user”, also Enright et al. see column 30, lines 33-67).

As to claim 3, Enright et al. as modified teaches comprising a public mode identifying unit which acquires a public-mode identification when the image data is captured by the data capturing unit, and wherein the access management unit correlates the public-mode identification with the image data stored by the data storing unit (See Enright et al. column 30, lines 10-44), and allows the stored image data to be accessed by all authorized users when the public-mode identification correlated with the image data is acquired (See Enright et al. claim 31, lines 5-67, and see Enright et al. column 32, lines 1-35).

As to claim 5, Enright et al. as modified teaches comprising an initialize command detecting unit which detects an initialize command, and an initialization unit which initializes the acquired owner identifications into initial values when the initialize command is detected (See Enright et al. column 35, lines 3-24).

As to claim 14, Enright et al. as modified teaches wherein the authorized user identifying unit acquires a standard user identification as one of a plurality of operator identifications when the image data is captured by the data capturing unit but any of the owner identifications are not acquired, and wherein the access management unit (See Enright et al. column 24, lines 7-45, where "owner identifications" is read on "identify the user", also see Enright et al. column 30, lines 33-67), correlates the standard user identification with the image data stored by the data storing unit, and allows the stored image data to be accessed when the standard user identification correlated with the image data is verified (See Enright et al. column 14, lines 49-67, also see Enright et al. column 16, lines 1-20).

As to claim 15, Enright et al. as modified teaches wherein the authorized user identifying unit acquires a standard user identification as one of a plurality of operator identifications when the image data is captured by the data capturing unit using a facsimile receiving function and any of the owner identifications are not acquired (See Enright et al. column 36, lines 49-65), and wherein the access management unit correlates the standard user identification with the image data stored by the data storing unit, and allows the stored image data to be accessed when the standard user identification correlated with the image data is verified (See Enright et al. column 24, lines 3-67).

As to claim 18, Enright et al. as modified teaches wherein the data storing unit includes a first storage device of the data processing apparatus and a second storage device of the file server (See Enright et al. column 16, lines 29-67), and wherein the data processing apparatus includes a

communication control unit which transmits the image data, stored in the first storage device, to the second storage device via the transmission path (See Enright et al. column 28, lines 22-67, where “data processing apparatus” is read on “the data transferring means”).

As to claim 19, Enright et al. teaches a data processing method for use in a data processing apparatus of a filing system, comprising the steps of:

capturing image data of a document into the data processing apparatus (See Enright et al. column 9, lines 23-45);

storing the captured image data onto an image storage medium (See Enright et al. column 14, lines 23-48, where “data capturing unit” is read on “cameras and other input devices”);

acquiring one or a plurality of owner identifications when the image data is captured into the data processing apparatus (See Enright et al. column 24, lines 7-45, where “owner identifications” is read on “identify the user”);

correlating the owner identifications with the image data stored on the image storage medium (See Enright et al. column 14, lines 49-67, also see Enright et al. column 16, lines 1-20);

allowing the stored image data to be accessed when any of the owner identifications correlated with the image data is verified (See Enright et al. column 14, lines 49-67, also see Enright et al. column 16, lines 1-20); and

outputting the image data in a readable manner by retrieving the stored image data of the image storage medium when the access to the image data is allowed (See Enright et al. column 13, lines 15-62).

Enright et al. does not teach each of the plurality of owner identification corresponding to respective one of a plurality of entities.

Yamazaki teaches each of the plurality of owner identification corresponding to respective one of a plurality of entities (See Yamazaki column 16, lines 1-26, also see Yamazaki column 2, lines 8-19, also see Yamazaki column 1, lines 16-30, prior art).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Enright et al. to include each of the plurality of owner identification corresponding to respective one of a plurality of entities.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Enright et al. by the teaching of Honda et al. to include each of the plurality of owner identification corresponding to respective one of a plurality of entities because it provides secure and accurate data.

As to claim 20, Enright et al. as modified teaches wherein, in the acquiring step, one or a plurality of operator identifications are acquired when the image data is captured, and, in the correlating step, the operator identifications are correlated with the stored image data, and, in the allowing step, the stored image data is allowed to be accessed when one of the operator identifications correlated with the image data is verified (See Enright et al. column 24, lines 7-45, where “owner identifications” is read on “identify the user”, also see Enright et al. column 30, lines 33-67).

As to claim 21, Enright et al. as modified teaches comprising the step of acquiring a public-mode identification when the image data is captured, and wherein, in the correlating step, the public-mode identification is correlated with the image data stored by the data storing unit (See Enright et al. column 30, lines 10-44), and, in the allowing step, the stored image data is allowed to be accessed by all authorized users when the public-mode identification correlated with the image data is acquired (See Enright et al. claim 31, lines 5-67, and see Enright et al. column 32, lines 1-35).

As to claim 23, Enright et al. as modified teaches comprising the steps of: detecting an initialize command; and initializing the acquired owner identifications into initial values when the initialize command is detected (See Enright et al. column 35, lines 3-24).

As to claim 24, Enright et al. as modified teaches comprising the steps of: displaying a list of user selection buttons corresponding to a plurality of authorized user identifications; and determining whether any inputs are given onto the displayed user selection buttons (See Enright et al. column 48, lines 10-30, also see Enright et al. column 53, lines 1-50).

As to claim 25, Enright et al. as modified teaches further comprising the step of acquiring a standard user identification as one of a plurality of operator identifications when the image data is captured but any of the owner identifications are not acquired (See Enright et al. column 24, lines 7-45, also see Enright et al. column 30, lines 33-67), and wherein, in the correlating step, the standard user identification is correlated with the stored image data, and, in the allowing step,

the stored image data is allowed to be accessed when the standard user identification correlated with the image data is verified (See Enright et al. column 14, lines 49-67, also see Enright et al. column 16, lines 1-20).

As to claim 26, Enright et al. as modified teaches further comprising the step of acquiring a standard user identification as one of a plurality of operator identifications when the image data is captured using a facsimile receiving function and any of the owner identifications are not acquired (See Enright et al. column 36, lines 49-65), and wherein, in the correlating step, the standard user identification is correlated with the stored image data, and, in the allowing step, the stored image data is allowed to be accessed when the standard user identification correlated with the image data is verified (See Enright et al. column 24, lines 3-67).

As to claim 29, Enright et al. as modified teaches further comprising the step of transmitting the image data, stored on the image storage medium, to a storage device of the file server via the transmission path (See Enright et al. column 27, lines 1-40).

As to claim 30, Enright et al. teaches a computer readable medium storing program code for causing a processor to execute a data acquisition processing on a data processing apparatus (See Enright et al. column 9, lines 23-45), the computer readable medium comprising:

first program code means for causing the processor to capture image data of a document into the data processing apparatus (See Enright et al. column 9, lines 23-45);

second program code means for causing the processor to store the captured image data onto an image storage medium of the data processing apparatus (See Enright et al. column 14, lines 23-48, where “data capturing unit” is read on “cameras and other input devices”);

third program code means for causing the processor to acquire one or a plurality of owner identifications when the image data is captured (See Enright et al. column 14, lines 49-67, also see Enright et al. column 16, lines 1-20);

fourth program code means for causing the processor to correlate the owner identifications with the image data stored on the image storage medium (See Enright et al. column 14, lines 49-67, also see Enright et al. column 16, lines 1-20), and for causing the processor to allow the stored image data to be accessed when any of the owner identifications correlated with the image data is verified (See Enright et al. column 14, lines 49-67, also see Enright et al. column 16, lines 1-20); and

fifth program code means for causing the processor to output the image data in a readable manner by retrieving the stored image data of the image storage medium when the access to the image data is allowed (See Enright et al. column 13, lines 15-62).

Enright et al. does not teach each of the plurality of owner identification corresponding to respective one of a plurality of entities.

Yamazaki teaches each of the plurality of owner identification corresponding to respective one of a plurality of entities (See Yamazaki column 16, lines 1-26, also see Yamazaki column 2, lines 8-19, also see Yamazaki column 1, lines 16-30, prior art).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Enright et al. to include each of the plurality of owner identification corresponding to respective one of a plurality of entities.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Enright et al. by the teaching of Honda et al. to include each of the plurality of owner identification corresponding to respective one of a plurality of entities because it provides secure and accurate data.

4. Claims 4, 6-9, 11-13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,813 B1) in view of Yamazaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,670,933 B1), further in view of Honda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,451 B2).

As to claim 4, Enright et al. as modified still does not teach comprising a capture inhibition identifying unit which acquires a capture-inhibition identification before the image data is captured by the data capturing unit, and wherein, when the capture-inhibition identification is acquired, the capturing of the image data by the data capturing unit is inhibited.

Honda et al. teaches comprising a capture inhibition identifying unit which acquires a capture-inhibition identification before the image data is captured by the data capturing unit, and wherein, when the capture-inhibition identification is acquired, the capturing of the image data by the data capturing unit is inhibited (See Honda et al. column 9, lines 51-55, where “capture-inhibition identification” is read on “ON/OFF” button”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified to include comprising a capture inhibition identifying unit which acquires a capture-inhibition identification before the image data is captured by the data capturing unit, and wherein, when the capture-inhibition identification is acquired, the capturing of the image data by the data capturing unit is inhibited.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified by the teaching of Honda et al. to include comprising a capture inhibition identifying unit which acquires a capture-inhibition identification before the image data is captured by the data capturing unit, and wherein, when the capture inhibition identification is acquired, the capturing of the image data by the data capturing unit is inhibited because it provides for secure and proper capturing of image.

As to claim 6, Enright et al. as modified still does not teach wherein the initialize command detecting unit includes a clock which measures an elapsed time from a start of operation of the data processing apparatus, and the initialize command is transmitted to the initialize command detecting unit when the elapsed time measured by the clock exceeds a predetermined reference period.

Honda et al. teaches wherein the initialize command detecting unit includes a clock which measures an elapsed time from a start of operation of the data processing apparatus, and the initialize command is transmitted to the initialize command detecting unit when the elapsed

time measured by the clock exceeds a predetermined reference period (See Honda et al. column 27, lines 1-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified to include wherein the initialize command detecting unit includes a clock which measures an elapsed time from a start of operation of the data processing apparatus, and the initialize command is transmitted to the initialize command detecting unit when the elapsed time measured by the clock exceeds a predetermined reference period.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified by the teaching of Honda et al. to include wherein the initialize command detecting unit includes a clock which measures an elapsed time from a start of operation of the data processing apparatus, and the initialize command is transmitted to the initialize command detecting unit when the elapsed time measured by the clock exceeds a predetermined reference period because management of time allows for efficient matching and accurate retrieval of stored image data.

As to claim 7, Enright et al. as modified still does not teach wherein the initialize command-detecting unit further detects the initialize command when an entire data processing on the data processing apparatus is terminated, and the initialization unit initializes the acquired owner identifications when the initialize command is detected.

Honda et al. teaches wherein the initialize command-detecting unit further detects the initialize command when an entire data processing on the data processing apparatus is

terminated, and the initialization unit initializes the acquired owner identifications when the initialize command is detected (See Honda et al. column 23, lines 26-33, also see Honda et al. column 24, lines 56-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified to include wherein the initialize command-detecting unit further detects the initialize command when an entire data processing on the data processing apparatus is terminated, and the initialization unit initializes the acquired owner identifications when the initialize command is detected.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified by the teaching of Honda et al. to include wherein the initialize command-detecting unit further detects the initialize command when an entire data processing on the data processing apparatus is terminated, and the initialization unit initializes the acquired owner identifications when the initialize command is detected because it provide for secure access to stored image data.

As to claim 8, Enright et al. as modified still does not teach wherein the authorized user identifying unit includes:

a list displaying unit which displays a list of user selection buttons corresponding to a plurality of authorized user identifications; and an input detecting unit which determines whether any inputs are given onto the user selection buttons displayed by the list displaying unit.

Honda et al. teaches wherein the authorized user identifying unit includes:

a list displaying unit which displays a list of user selection buttons corresponding to a plurality of authorized user identifications; and an input detecting unit which determines whether any inputs are given onto the user selection buttons displayed by the list displaying unit (See Honda et al. column 17, lines 13-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified to include wherein the authorized user identifying unit includes: a list displaying unit which displays a list of user selection buttons corresponding to a plurality of authorized user identifications; and an input detecting unit which determines whether any inputs are given onto the user selection buttons displayed by the list displaying unit.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified by the teaching of Honda et al. to include wherein the authorized user identifying unit includes: a list displaying unit which displays a list of user selection buttons corresponding to a plurality of authorized user identifications; and an input detecting unit which determines whether any inputs are given onto the user selection buttons displayed by the list displaying unit because accessing selections but user allows for customized access with mode setting suitable for user preferences.

As to claim 9, Enright et al. as modified teaches wherein the list displaying unit displays the list of the user selection buttons in a sequence of the authorized user identifications being defined in a user information file (See Enright et al. column 53, lines 3-28, also see Enright et al. column 54, lines 4-22).

As to claim 11, Enright et al. as modified teaches wherein the authorized user identifying unit further includes an input history recording unit which records a latest user selection count for each of the inputs to the user selection button, and the list displaying unit displays a set of frequent-selection user buttons based on the latest user selection counts thereof (See Honda et al. column 28, lines 16-43).

As to claim 12, Enright et al. as modified teaches when any inputs to the user selection buttons are first given, the authorized user identifying unit acquires ones of a plurality of operator identifications corresponding to the input user selection buttons, and when any inputs to the user selection buttons are subsequently given, the authorized user identifying unit acquires ones of the plurality of owner identifications corresponding to the input user selection buttons (See Honda et al. column 17, lines 13-30).

As to claim 13, Enright et al. as modified teaches wherein the data processing apparatus has a copying function, a facsimile function and a scanning function, the data capturing unit capturing the image data by using one of the copying, facsimile and scanning functions, and the list of the user selection buttons corresponding to the frequent-selection owner identifications and a list of function selection buttons corresponding to the copying, facsimile and scanning functions are displayed together on a user/function select page (See Enright et al. column 26, lined 10-23, also see Enright et al. column 36, lines 56-65, also see Enright et al. column 42, lines 10-62).

As to claim 22, Enright et al. as modified still does not teach comprising the step of acquiring a capture-inhibition identification before the image data is captured, and wherein, when the capture-inhibition identification is acquired, the capturing of the image data in the capturing step is inhibited.

Honda et al. teaches comprising the step of acquiring a capture-inhibition identification before the image data is captured, and wherein, when the capture-inhibition identification is acquired, the capturing of the image data in the capturing step is inhibited (See Honda et al. column 9, lines 51-55, where “capture-inhibition identification” is read on “ON/OFF” button”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified to include comprising the step of acquiring a capture-inhibition identification before the image data is captured, and wherein; when the capture-inhibition identification is acquired, the capturing of the image data in the capturing step is inhibited.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified by the teaching of Honda et al. to include comprising the step of acquiring a capture-inhibition identification before the image data is captured, and wherein, when the capture-inhibition identification is acquired, the capturing of the image data in the capturing step is inhibited because it provides for secure and proper capturing of image.

5. Claims 16-17, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,813 B1) in view of Yamazaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,670,933 B1), further in view of Lewis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,469).

As to claim 16, Enright et al. as modified teaches wherein the access management unit includes a standard user identification setting unit which acquires a standard user identification, the standard user identification being predetermined on a display device of a client data processing apparatus (See Enright et al. column 14, lines 49-67).

Enright et al. as modified still does not teach transmitted to the access management unit by using a Web server function.

Lewis et al. teaches transmitted to the access management unit by using a Web server function (See Lewis et al. column 13, lines 10-29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified to include transmitted to the access management unit by using a Web server function.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified by the teaching of Lewis et al. to include transmitted to the access management unit by using a Web server function because web access display methods are well known in the art and allow for connectivity among dispersed geographic locations.

As to claim 17, Enright et al. as modified still does not teach comprising a monitoring/displaying unit which monitors an amount of available storage of the image storage medium and displays the amount of the available storage, wherein, when the amount of the available storage of the image storage medium is below a lower limit, a warning message indicating a lack of the available storage is displayed.

Lewis et al teaches comprising a monitoring/displaying unit which monitors an amount of available storage of the image storage medium and displays the amount of the available storage, wherein, when the amount of the available storage of the image storage medium is below a lower limit, a warning message indicating a lack of the available storage is displayed (See Lewis et al. column 12, lines 64-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified to include comprising a monitoring/displaying unit which monitors an amount of available storage of the image storage medium and displays the amount of the available storage, wherein, when the amount of the available storage of the image storage medium is below a lower limit, a warning message indicating a lack of the available storage is displayed.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified by the teaching of Lewis et al. to include comprising a monitoring/displaying unit which monitors an amount of available storage of the image storage medium and displays the amount of the available storage, wherein, when the amount of the available storage of the image storage medium is below a lower limit, a warning message indicating a lack of the available storage is displayed because displaying a

warning message showing storage threshold allows for better storage management and data allocation.

As to claim 27, Enright et al. as modified teaches wherein the standard user identification is predetermined on a display device of a client data processing apparatus in the filing system (See Enright et al. column 14, lines 23-48, also see Enright et al. figure 22).

Enright et al. as modified does not teach transmitted to the image storage medium of the data processing apparatus by using a Web server function.

Lewis et al. teaches transmitted to the image storage medium of the data processing apparatus by using a Web server function (See Lewis et al. column 13, lines 10-29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified to include transmitted to the image storage medium of the data processing apparatus by using a Web server function.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified by the teaching of Lewis et al. to include transmitted to the image storage medium of the data processing apparatus by using a Web server function because web access display methods are well known in the art and allow for connectivity among dispersed geographic locations.

As to claim 28, Enright et al. as modified does not teach comprising the steps of:

monitoring an amount of available storage of the image storage medium; and displaying the amount of the available storage, and wherein, when the amount of the available storage of the image storage medium is below a lower limit, a warning message indicating a lack of the available storage is displayed.

Lewis et al teaches comprising the steps of:

monitoring an amount of available storage of the image storage medium; and displaying the amount of the available storage, and wherein, when the amount of the available storage of the image storage medium is below a lower limit, a warning message indicating a lack of the available storage is displayed (See Lewis et al. column 12, lines 64-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified to include comprising the steps of: monitoring an amount of available storage of the image storage medium; and displaying the amount of the available storage, and wherein, when the amount of the available storage of the image storage medium is below a lower limit, a warning message indicating a lack of the available storage is displayed.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified by the teaching of Lewis et al. to include comprising the steps of: monitoring an amount of available storage of the image storage medium; and displaying the amount of the available storage, and wherein, when the amount of the available storage of the image storage medium is below a lower limit, a warning message indicating a lack of the available storage is displayed because displaying a warning message showing storage threshold allows for better storage management and data allocation.

6. Claims 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,813 B1) in view of Yamazaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,670,933 B1), further in view of Honda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,451 B2) as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Lewis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,469).

As to claim 10, Enright et al. as modified still does not teach wherein, each time: the inputs to the user selection buttons are given, a display color of each of the input user selection buttons is changed to a separate color that is indicative of the authorized user identification selection.

Lewis et al. teaches wherein, each time: the inputs to the user selection buttons are given, a display color of each of the input user selection buttons is changed to a separate color that is indicative of the authorized user identification selection (See Lewis et al. column 11, lines 1-31, also see abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified to include wherein, each time: the inputs to the user selection buttons are given, a display color of each of the input user selection buttons is changed to a separate color that is indicative of the authorized user identification selection.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Enright et al. as modified by the teaching of Lewis et al. to include wherein, each time: the inputs to the user selection buttons are given, a display

color of each of the input user selection buttons is changed to a separate color that is indicative of the authorized user identification selection because changing the display color allows for easier monitoring and access of operator buttons by user.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2165

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 571-272-4074.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5: 30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 571-272-4038. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Neveen Abel-Jalil

February 2, 2005



**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**